arXiv:1511.01215v3 [math.AP] 2 Feb 2016

NON-DIVERGENCE PARABOLIC EQUATIONS OF SECOND ORDER WITH CRITICAL DRIFT IN LEBESGUE SPACES

GONG CHEN

Abstract. We consider uniformly parabolic equations and inequalities of second order in the non-divergence form with drift

$$-u_t + Lu = -u_t + \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u + \sum b_i D_i u = 0 \, (\geq 0, \leq 0)$$

in some domain $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. We prove growth theorems and the interior Harnack inequality as the main results. In this paper, we will only assume the drift b is in certain Lebesgue spaces which are critical under the parabolic scaling but not necessarily to be bounded. In the last section, some applications of the interior Harnack inequality are presented. In particular, we show there is a "universal" spectral gap for the associated elliptic operator. The counterpart for uniformly elliptic equations of second order in non-divergence form is shown in [S10].

1. Introduction

1.1. **General Introduction.** The qualitative properties of solutions to partial differential equations have been intensively studied for a long time. In this paper, we consider the qualitative properties of solutions to the uniformly parabolic equation in non-divergence form,

$$-u_t + Lu := -u_t + \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u + \sum_i b_i D_i u = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

and the associated inequalities: $-u_t + Lu \geq 0$ and $-u_t + Lu \leq 0$. Throughout the paper, we use the notations $D_i := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$, $D_{ij} := \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ and $u_t := \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$. We assume $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ and a_{ij}'s are real measurable, a_{ij}'s also satisfy the *uniform parabolicity condition*

$$\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, \, \nu^{-1} |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(X) \xi_i \xi_j, \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^2 \leq \nu^2 \tag{1.2}$$

with some constant $\nu \geq 1$, $\forall X = (x,t)$ in the domain of definition $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

For the drift b, we will only require it is in certain Lebesgue spaces which are critical under the parabolic scaling. To formulate our setting more precisely, we assume over the domain of definition Q,

$$\|b\|_{L_x^p L_t^q} := \left(\int \left[\int |b(x,t)|^q \, dt \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} =: S(Q) < \infty, \tag{1.3}$$

Date: 05/29/15.

Key words and phrases. Second-order parabolic equations, Harnack inequality, measurable coefficients, spectral gap.

for some constants p, $q \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{n}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 1. \tag{1.4}$$

By "critical", we mean that with the $L_x^p L_t^q$ norm, the drift is scaling invariant under the parabolic scaling: for $r > 0$,

$$x \to r^{-1}x, \ t \to r^{-2}t.$$

Indeed, suppose u satisfies

$$-u_t + \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u + \sum_i b_i D_i u = 0.$$

in a domain $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then for any constant $r > 0$, let

$$\tilde{x} = r^{-1}x, \ \tilde{t} = r^{-2}t.$$

Then $\widetilde{u}\left(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}\right) = u\left(r\tilde{x}, r^2\tilde{t}\right)$ satisfies the equation

$$-\widetilde{u}_{\tilde{t}} + \sum_{ij} \widetilde{a_{ij}} D_{ij} \widetilde{u} + \sum_i \tilde{b}_i D_i \widetilde{u} = 0,$$

in $Q_r := \{(x,t), (rx, r^2t) \in Q\}$. Note that $\tilde{b} = rb$, so

$$S(Q_r) = \left\|\tilde{b}\right\|_{L_x^p L_t^q} = \|b\|_{L_x^p L_t^q} = S(Q).$$

In general, regarding the scaling, intuitively, there is a competition between the transport term and the diffusion part. One might expect that for the supercritical scaling case, $\frac{n}{p} + \frac{2}{q} > 1$: the solutions of the equations have discontinuities [SVZ, GC]. For the critical situation we are considering here, we have Hölder continuous solutions, see Theorem 22. Finally, if the drift is subcritical with respect to the scaling, i.e. $\frac{n}{p} + \frac{2}{q} < 1$, we expect the solutions will be smooth.

We will concentrate on the interior Harnack inequality for parabolic equations in non-divergence form with critical drift. Given constants p, q satisfying condition (1.4), let Q be an open set in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we define

$$W_{p,q}(Q) := C(Q) \cap W_{p,q}^{2,1}(Q)$$

where $f \in W_{p,q}^{2,1}(Q)$ means f_t, $D_i f$, $D_{ij} f \in (L_x^p L_t^q)_{loc}$.

With the assumptions above, the main result in this paper is then expressed by Theorem 1.

Theorem 1 (Interior Harnack Inequality)**.** *Given constants p, q satisfying condition* (1.4)*, suppose $u \in W_{p,q}$ and $-u_t + Lu = 0$ in $Q_{2r}(Y) := B_{2r}(y) \times (s - (2r)^2, s)$, $Y = (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $r > 0$. If $u \geq 0$, then*

$$\sup_{Q^0} u \leq N \inf_{Q_r} u, \tag{1.5}$$

where $N := N(n, \nu, p, q, S)$, $Q_r(Y) := B_r(y) \times (s - r^2, s)$, $Q^0 := B_r(y) \times (s - 3r^2, s - 2r^2)$ and S is from condition (1.3)*.*

Remark. We will see the most general form of Harnack principle in the later section on the applications of Harnack inequality.

Harnack inequalities have many important applications, not only in differential equations, but also in other areas, such as diffusion processes, geometry, etc. Unlike the classical maximum principle, the interior Harnack inequality is far from obvious. For elliptic and parabolic equations with measurable coefficients in the divergence form, it was proved by Moser in the papers [M61],[M64]. However, a similar result for non-divergence equations was obtained 15 years later after Moser's papers by Krylov and Safonov [KS], [S80] in 1978-80. Their proofs relied on some improved versions of growth theorems from the book by Landis [EML]. These growth theorems control the behavior of (sub-, super-) solutions of second order elliptic and parabolic equations in terms of the Lebesgue measure of areas in which solutions are positive or negative. In [FS], Ferretti and Safonov used growth theorems as a common background for both divergence and non-divergence equations and used these three growth theorems to derive the interior Harnack inequality. Even in the one-dimensional case, the Harnack inequality fails for equations of a "joint" structure, which combine both divergence and non-divergence parts. One can find detailed discussion in [CS13].

At the beginning, the interior Harnack inequality was proved with bounded drift. Later on, this condition was relaxed to subcritical drift b. For the subcritical case, we can always rescale the problem. In small scale, the drift will work like a perturbation from the case without drift. But for the critical situation, our common tricks do not work. One can find a historical overview of this progress in [NU]. For non-divergence elliptic equations of second order, in [S10], Safonov shown the interior Harnack inequality for the scaling critical case $b \in L^n$. In this paper, we adapt Safonov's idea to the parabolic setting. We will consider the case that the drift b is in critical scaling Lebesgue spaces given by the conditions (1.3) and (1.4) above. In a later paper [GC], we will consider critical scaling Morrey spaces with different approaches. Similar results for both divergence form elliptic and parabolic equations are presented in [NU].

We will follow the unified approach to growth theorems and the interior Harnack inequality developed in [FS]. For this purpose, we need to prove three growth theorems and derive the interior Harnack inequality as a consequence for parabolic equations with critical drift formulated as above. We only present the case $b \in L_x^n L_t^\infty$. For other cases ($p > n$, $q < \infty$) the proofs are more or less identical to the situation we are considering here. We will see remarks about them later on. For certain points, other cases ($p > n$, $q < \infty$) are simpler than the endpoint case ($p = n$, $q = \infty$) we are discussing here. Namely, throughout the paper, we assume over the domain of definition Q,

$$\int \left[\sup_t |b(x,t)|\right]^n dx = S < \infty \tag{1.6}$$

where sup means essential supremum. One point compared with the results for divergence form equations in [NU] is that our conclusions for $L_x^n L_t^\infty$ case do not depend on the modulus of continuity of the norm. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that all functions (coefficients and solutions) are smooth enough. It is easy to get rid of extra smoothness assumptions by means of standard approximation procedures, see Section 7. We should notice that it is important to have appropriate estimates for solutions with constants depending only on the prescribed quantities,

such as the dimension n, the parabolicity constant, etc., but not depending on "additional" smoothness.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 1, we introduce our basic assumptions and notations. In Section 2, we formulate a weak version of the classical maximum principle, the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate, and some consequences of it. In Sections 3, 4, and 5, we formulate and prove three growth theorems. In Section 6, we derive the interior Harnack inequality. In Section 7, we use approximation to show all results are valid without extra smoothness assumption. Finally, in Section 8, we discuss some applications of the interior Harnack inequality. In particular, we show there is a "universal" spectral gap between the principal eigenvalue and other eigenvalues for the elliptic operator L with drift $b \in L^n$. In the appendix, we will prove the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate we use in this paper.

1.2. **Notations:** In this paper, we use summation convention.

"$A := B$" or "$B =: A$" is the definition of A by means of the expression B.

Definition 2. For any open set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we define the space

$$W(Q) := C(Q) \cap W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}(Q), \tag{1.7}$$

where $f \in W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}(Q)$ means f_t, $D_i f$, $D_{ij} f \in (L^n_x L^\infty_t)_{loc}$.

$\mathbb{R}^n$ is the n-dimensional Euclidean space, $n \geq 1$, with points $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^t$, where x_i's are real numbers. Here the symbol t stands for the transposition of vectors which indicates that vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are treated as column vectors. For $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^t$ and $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^t$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the scalar product $(x, y) := \Sigma x_i y_i$, the length of x is $|x| := (x, x)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

For a Borel set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\bar{\Gamma} := \Gamma \cup \partial\Gamma$ is the closure of Γ, $|\Gamma|$ is the n-dimensional Lebesgue measure of Γ. Sometimes we use the same notation for the surface measure of a subset Γ of a smooth surface S.

For real numbers c, we denote $c_+ := \max(c, 0)$, $c_- := \max(-c, 0)$.

In order to formulate our results, we need some standard definitions and notations for the setting of parabolic equations.

Definition 3. Let Q be an open connected set in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $n \geq 1$. The parabolic boundary $\partial_p Q$ of Q is the set of all points $X_0 = (x_0, t_0) \in \partial Q$, such that there exists a continuous function $x = x(t)$ on the interval $[t_0, t_0 + \delta)$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^n$, such that $x(t_0) = x_0$ and $(x(t), t) \in Q$ for all $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \delta)$. Here $x = x(t)$ and $\delta > 0$ depend on X_0. In particular, for cylinders $Q_\Omega = \Omega \times (0, T)$ with $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the parabolic boundary $\partial_p Q_\Omega := (\partial_x Q_\Omega) \cup (\partial_t Q_\Omega)$, where $\partial_x Q_\Omega := (\partial\Omega) \times (0, T)$, $\partial_t Q_\Omega := \Omega \times \{0\}$.

We will use the following notation for the "standard" parabolic cylinder. For $Y = (y, s)$ and $r > 0$, we define $Q_r(Y) := B_r(y) \times (s - r^2, s)$, where $B_r(y) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - y| < r\}$.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly discuss some well-known theorems and results which are crucial for us to carry out the discussion in the later parts of this paper. We use the notation $u \in W(Q) = C(Q) \cap W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}(Q)$ in the sense of Definition 2. Also we denote $S = \int [\sup_t |b(x, t)|]^n \, dx < \infty$

Theorem 4 (Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate)**.** *Suppose $u \in W(\Omega)$ and $\Omega \subset Q_r$ and $-u_t + Lu \geq f$. If $\sup_{\partial_p \Omega} u \leq 0$, then*

$$\sup_{\Omega} u \leq N(\nu, n, S) r \left\| f \right\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty}. \tag{2.1}$$

We will present the detailed proof of above theorem in Appendix A.

Remark 5. In [AIN], Nazarov shown the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate holds for the drift $b \in L_x^p L_t^q$, i.e.,

$$\|b\|_{L_x^p L_t^q} = \left(\int \left[\int |b(x,t)|^q \, dt \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty,$$

for

$$\frac{n}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \leq 1, \ p, q \geq 1.$$

The proof was based on Krylov's ideas and methods [NVK]. In this paper, we mainly focus the case $p = n$ and $q = \infty$. The approach in this paper is easily modified to show the general scaling invariant cases, i.e., for some constants p, $q \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{n}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 1, \ q < \infty.$$

We will discuss this point again later on.

Theorem 6 (Maximal Principle)**.** *Let Q be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, and let a function $u \in C^{2,1}\left(\bar{Q} \backslash \partial_p Q\right) \cap C(\bar{Q})$ satisfy the inequality $-u_t + Lu \geq 0$ in Q. Then*

$$\sup_{Q} u = \sup_{\partial_p Q} u \tag{2.2}$$

As an easy consequence of the maximal principle and the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate, we have the well-known comparison principle.

Theorem 7 (Comparison Principle)**.** *Let Q be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, u, $v \in W(Q) \cap C(\bar{Q})$, $-u_t + Lu \leq -v_t + Lv$ in Q, and $u \geq v$ on $\partial_p Q$, then $u \geq v$ on $\bar{Q}$.*

3. First Growth Theorem

Suppose R is the region in a cylinder where a subsolution u of our equation is positive. The first growth theorem, Theorem 12, basically tells us if the measure of R is small, then the maximal value of u over half of the cylinder is strictly less than the maximal value over the whole cylinder. In other words, it gives us some quantitative decay properties.

Before we start to prove the first growth theorem, we need to prove several intermediate results based on the comparison principle and the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate. Let us first do some preliminary calculations in order to carry out some comparison arguments.

For fixed numbers $\alpha > 0$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$, in the cylinder $Q = B_r(0) \times (-r^2, (\alpha - 1)r^2)$, we can define

$$\psi_0 = \frac{(1-\epsilon^2)(t + r^2)}{\alpha} + \epsilon^2 r^2 \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\psi_1 = \left(\psi_0 - |x|^2\right)_+ \tag{3.2}$$

where $(\cdot)_+$ means positive part of the function. And we also define

$$\psi = \psi_1^2 \psi_0^{-q} \tag{3.3}$$

for some number $q \geq 2$ to be determined later. First of all, we notice ψ is $C^{2,1}$ in $\widetilde{Q} := \left\{(x,t) | \, |x|^2 < \psi_0, \, -r^2 < t < (\alpha-1)r^2\right\}$. It is clear that $-\psi_t + L\psi = 0$ if $\psi_0 \leq |x|^2$. Now if $\psi_0 > |x|^2$, by some computations, we obtain

$$-\psi_t + \sum a_{ij} D_{i,j} \psi = \psi_0^{-q} \left[8 a_{ij} x_i x_j - 4\psi_1 trace(a_{ij}) + \frac{(1-\epsilon^2)q}{\alpha \psi_0} \psi_1^2 - 2\frac{(1-\epsilon^2)}{\alpha} \psi_1 \right].$$

Set $F_1 = \frac{2}{\alpha} + 8n\nu^{-1}$, and $\xi = \frac{\psi_1}{\psi_0}$ then

$$-\psi_t + \sum a_{ij} D_{ij} \psi \geq \psi_0^{1-q} \left[\frac{(1-\epsilon^2)q}{\alpha} \xi^2 - F_1 \xi + 8\lambda \right]. \tag{3.4}$$

Pick

$$q = 2 + \frac{\alpha}{32(1-\epsilon^2)}, \tag{3.5}$$

so that the quadratic form in (3.4) is non-negative. Then we get

$$-\psi_t + \sum a_{ij} D_{ij} \psi \geq 0, \quad \forall (x,t) \in Q.$$

We also notice that

$$\psi(x, -r^2) \leq (\epsilon r)^{-2q+4}, \quad \forall |x| \leq r,$$

and

$$\psi\left(x, (\alpha-1)r^2\right) \geq \frac{9}{16} r^{-2q+4}, \quad \forall |x| \leq \frac{r}{2}. \tag{3.6}$$

Finally, we notice that by the monotonicity of ψ with respect to $t \in \left[-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2\right]$ for $x = 0$, we obtain

$$\psi(0,t) \geq \frac{9}{16} r^{-2q+4}, \; t \in \left[-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2\right]. \tag{3.7}$$

With the help of ψ we just constructed in (3.3),in Lemma 8, we first show that when the drift b is small enough, if we stay away from the lateral boundary of a standard cylinder. Then we have a lower bound for a positive supersolution u $(-u_t + Lu \leq 0)$ in a spacial region of the bottom of the cylinder, then we also have a lower bound for u in the same region on the top of the cylinder. Intuitively, it basically tells us u will not decay dramatically in the same spatial region if we stay away from the lateral boundary.

Lemma 8. *Let α be positive constant and $-u_t + Lu \leq 0$ in Ω. Suppose $Q := B_r(0) \times (-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2) \subset \Omega$ and $u > 0$ in Q. Then there are positive constants $s_1 := s_1(n,\nu)$, $C_1 := C_1(n,\nu)$ and $k := k(n,\nu,\alpha)$ such that if*

$$u \geq \ell \tag{3.8}$$

on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0) \times \{-r^2\}$ and $\left(\|b\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty(Q)}\right)^n \leq s_1 \leq S$, then

$$u \geq C_1 (\frac{1}{2})^k \ell \tag{3.9}$$

on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0) \times \{(\alpha-1)r^2\}$.

The above lemma is a special situation of Lemma 7.39 in [GL2] with some mollification.

Proof. We apply the results from the preliminary calculations with case $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. Consider

$$v = u - \ell(\frac{1}{2}r)^{2q-4}\psi. \tag{3.10}$$

Notice that with the q from the above calculation, we have

$$-\psi_t + L\psi \geq b_i D_i \psi = -4\psi_1 \psi_0^{-q}(b,x) \geq -4|b|r(\frac{1}{2})^{-2q} r^{2-2q}. \tag{3.11}$$

Also it is clear $\psi = 0$ for $|x| = r$. So we can conclude that $v \geq 0$ on $\partial_p \widetilde{Q}$ by the above calculation and $u \geq \ell$ on the bottom. Finally, we apply Theorem 4 to $-v$, we obtain

$$v \geq -N(n,\nu,s_1)\ell(\frac{1}{2})^{-4} s_1^{\frac{1}{n}} \tag{3.12}$$

in $\widetilde{Q}$. In other words, we have

$$u \geq \ell(\frac{1}{2}r)^{2q-4}\psi - N(n,\nu,s_1)\ell(\frac{1}{2})^{-4} s_1^{\frac{1}{n}}. \tag{3.13}$$

By the calculation above again, we conclude that

$$u \geq \ell(\frac{1}{2})^{-4}\left[\frac{9}{16}(\frac{1}{2})^{2q} - N(n,\nu,s_1)s_1^{\frac{1}{n}}\right]. \tag{3.14}$$

for $|x| \leq \frac{r}{2}$. Pick $s_1 := s_1(n,\nu)$ small enough ($N(n,\nu,s_1)$ is decreasing when s_1 decays) to force the inequality ,

$$\left[\frac{9}{16}(\frac{1}{2})^{2q} - N(n,\nu,s_1)s_1^{\frac{1}{n}}\right] \geq \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2})^{2q}. \tag{3.15}$$

We conclude

$$u \geq C_1(\frac{1}{2})^k \ell \tag{3.16}$$

on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0) \times \{(\alpha-1)r^2\}$, with $k = 2q-4$ and C_1 does not depend on u. As a byproduct, we can also conclude that

$$u(0,t) \geq C_1(\frac{1}{2})^k \ell, \ \ \forall t \in [-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2]. \tag{3.17}$$

□

Next, by iterating Lemma 8 and applying the pigeonhole principle, we show that under the same assumptions on u as above but without the assumption of the smallness of b, if u has a lower bound on the bottom of a cylinder, then u still has a lower bound for later time at least in some small region in space.

Lemma 9. *Let α a be positive constant and $-u_t + Lu \leq 0$ in Ω. Suppose $Q := B_r(0) \times (-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2) \subset \Omega$ and $u > 0$ in Q. If u has a lower bound on the bottom of the cylinder,*

$$u \geq \ell \tag{3.18}$$

on $B_r(0) \times \{-r^2\}$, then it has a lower bound on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0) \times \{(\alpha-1)r^2\}$,

$$u \geq C(n,\nu,S,\alpha)\ell \tag{3.19}$$

for some positive constant $C := C(n, \nu, S, \alpha)$ *where* $S := \left(\|b\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty}\right)^n$. *In particular*

$$u(0, (\alpha-1)r^2) \geq C(n, \nu, S, \alpha)\ell \tag{3.20}$$

Proof. The result can be proved by iterating Lemma 8. We divide

$$\left[B_r(0) \times (-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2)\right] \setminus \left[B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0) \times (-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2)\right]$$

into m pieces of cylindrical shells where $m = [\frac{S}{s_1}] + 1$, where s_1 satisfies the conditions in Lemma 8 . If we denote $r_k = \frac{r}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{kr}{m}$ for $k = 1, \dots m$, each of those shells is of the form

$$V_k = \left(B_{r_k}(0) \backslash B_{r_{k-1}}(0)\right) \times (-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2)$$

where $k = 1, \dots, m$. Then at least over one of these shells, say, V_{k_0}, such that $\left[\|b\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty(V_{k_0})}\right]^n \leq s_1$, i.e. the norm of the drift is small over V_{k_0}. For any $|y_{k_0}| = \frac{r}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{k_0 r}{m} - \frac{1}{4}\frac{r}{m}$, we can apply the above lemma iteratively to the cylinders

$$B_{\frac{1}{4}\frac{r}{m}}(y_{k_0}) \times \left(-r^2, -r^2 + \alpha\left(\frac{1}{4}\frac{r}{m}\right)^2\right), \dots,$$
$$B_{\frac{1}{4}\frac{r}{m}}(y_{k_0}) \times \left(-r^2 + h\alpha\left(\frac{1}{4}\frac{r}{m}\right)^2, -r^2 + (h+1)\alpha\left(\frac{1}{4}\frac{r}{m}\right)^2\right)$$

where $h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $-r^2 + (h+1)\left(\frac{1}{4}\frac{r}{m}\right)^2 = (\alpha-1)r^2$. In other words, we apply Lemma 8 iteratively and put those small cylinders together vertically in one particular cylinder shell. We have $\forall\, |y_{k_0}| = \frac{r}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{k_0 r}{m} - \frac{1}{4}\frac{r}{m}$ and $\forall t \in \left[-r^2, (\alpha-1)r^2\right]$, $u(y_{k_0}, t) \geq C'(n, \nu, S, \alpha)\ell$ for some constant C'. Finally, with the maximal principle applied to $-u$ and the lower bound on u on the bottom, we conclude that on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0) \times \{(\alpha-1)r^2\}$, for some constant $C(n, \nu, S, \alpha)$

$$u \geq C(n, \nu, S, \alpha)\ell, \tag{3.21}$$

and

$$u(0, (\alpha-1)r^2) \geq C(n, \nu, S, \alpha)\ell. \tag{3.22}$$

□

Analogous results to Lemmas 8, 9 also hold for a slanted cylinder setting. For a fixed point $Y = (y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $s > 0$, and $r > 0$, define the slanted cylinder

$$V_r = V_r(Y) := \left\{X = (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1};\ \left|x - \frac{t}{s}y\right| < r, 0 < t < s\right\}. \tag{3.23}$$

Lemma 10. *Let a function* $u \in C^{2,1}(\overline{V_r})$ *satisfy* $-u_t + Lu \leq 0$ *in a slanted cylinder* V_r, *which is defined in* (3.23) *with* $Y = (y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $s > 0$, $r > 0$, *such that*

$$K^{-1}r|y| \leq s \leq Kr^2 \tag{3.24}$$

where $K > 0$ *is a constant. In addition, suppose* $u \geq \ell$ *on* $D_r := B_r(0) \times \{0\}$. *Then*

$$u \geq C(n, \nu, S, K)\ell \tag{3.25}$$

on $B_{\frac{1}{2}r}(y) \times \{s\}$. *In particular,*

$$u(y,s) \geq C(n,\nu,S,K)\ell. \tag{3.26}$$

Proof. This can be proved using the result for the standard cylinder setting with a change of variables. First of all, we notice that $s/r^2 \leq K$ so α in above lemmas is bounded by K. We rescale $V_r(Y)$ to $V_1(Y)$ since all the quantities we are considering are scaling invariant. Next we make a change of variables. We notice that with $k_i := \frac{y_i}{s}$ and $\frac{|y_i|}{s} = |k_i| \leq \frac{|y|}{s} \leq K$, then define $w_i = x_i - k_i t$ and $z = t$. In this coordinate, the slanted cylinder is transformed to a standard cylinder. The equation with respect to the new coordinate is

$$-u_z + \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{w_i w_j} u + \sum_i (b_i + k_i) D_{w_i} u \leq 0. \tag{3.27}$$

Then we apply the stand cylinder result to the equation with respect to coordinate (w, z). we have

$$u(y,s) \geq C(n,\nu,S,K)\ell.$$

□

Now the useful slanted cylinder lemma [FS] follows easily from Lemma 10. We can apply Lemma 10 to $1-u$ after we multiply u by a constant to reduce our problem to the case $1 = \sup_{V_r(Y)} u_+$. We have the following result:

Lemma 11 (Slanted Cylinder Lemma)**.** *Let a function* $u \in C^{2,1}(\overline{V_r})$ *satisfy* $-u_t + Lu \geq 0$ *in a slanted cylinder* V_r*, which is defined in* (3.23) *with* $Y = (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$*,* $s > 0$*,* $r > 0$*, such that*

$$K^{-1} r|y| \leq s \leq K r^2 \tag{3.28}$$

where $K > 1$ *is a constant. In addition, suppose* $u \leq 0$ *on* $D_r := B_r(0) \times \{0\}$*. Then*

$$u(Y) \leq \beta_2 \sup_{V_r(Y)} u_+ \tag{3.29}$$

with a constant $\beta_2 = \beta_2(\nu, n, K, S) < 1$.

With the above comparison results, we can proceed to our proof of the first growth theorem. We will do the construction in the spirit of [S10] and use the structure of the parabolic maximal principle.

Theorem 12 (First Growth Theorem)**.** *Let a function* $u \in C^{2,1}(\overline{Q_r})$ *where* $r > 0$ *and* $Q_r = Q_r(Y)$ *is a standard cylinder, in* $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ *containing* $Y := (y,s)$*. Suppose* $-u_t + Lu \geq 0$ *in* Q_r*, then* $\forall \beta_1 \in (0,1)$*, there exists* $0 < \mu < 1$ *such that if we know*

$$|\{u > 0\} \cap Q_r(Y)| \leq \mu |Q_r(Y)|, \tag{3.30}$$

then

$$\mathcal{M}_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y) \leq \beta_1 \mathcal{M}_r(Y), \tag{3.31}$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_r(Y) := \max_{Q_r(Y)} u_+.$$

In addition, we also notice that $\beta_1 \to 0^+$ *as* $\mu \to 0^+$.

Roughly, in order to prove the first growth theorem, one can use a elliptic type argument similar to the one in [S10] to find a certain region where the drift is small. Then we just treat the small drift as a perturbation or an error term in the proof of the case without drift term. With the above comparison results. We can use a slanted cylinder to joint an arbitrary point in the standard cylinder and some portion of the region we found by the elliptic argument. Finally we apply Lemma 10 to the slanted cylinder to have some control of the value of u.

Remark 13. First of all, we make some reductions. In our problem, we want to show under some conditions, given $-u_t + Lu \geq 0$ in a cylinder $Q_r(Y)$, and some information about the set $\{u \leq 0\}$, we want to show that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y) \leq \beta_1 \mathcal{M}_r(Y).$$

Clearly, in order to derive the above estimate, we only need to consider positive part of u. We observe that to obtain the above estimate, it actually suffices to get

$$u(Y) \leq \beta_1 \mathcal{M}_r(Y), \tag{3.32}$$

for some $\beta_1 \in (0,1)$. Indeed, for an arbitrary point $Z \in Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y)$, we notice $Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Z) \subset Q_r(Y)$, we can apply the above estimate (3.32) to $Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Z)$ with Y replaced by Z and r replaced by $\frac{r}{2}$ with some measure condition μ'. With respect to the measure condition in the first growth theorem, we also observe that

$$\left|\{u > 0\} \cap Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Z)\right| \leq \left|\{u > 0\} \cap Q_r(Y)\right| \leq \mu \left|Q_r\right| = 2^{n+2}\mu \left|Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Z)\right|.$$

So we just need to take $\mu = 2^{-n-2}\mu'$ for the measure condition in the first growth theorem.

Remark 14. In the first growth theorem, we point out that when μ goes to 0, β_1 goes to 0. But actually, it suffices to show that if μ is small enough, $\beta_1 := \beta_1(n, \nu, S, \mu) < 1$. Indeed, we can apply the above estimate inductively to $Q_{2^{-k}}(Y)$. To illustrate the idea, without loss of generality, we can apply the above estimate to $Z_1 \in Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y)$ and $Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Z_1)$, we have $u(Z_1) < \beta_1 < 1$, $\forall Z_1 \in Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y)$. Then we apply the above estimate again to u/β_1 in all points $Z_2 \in Q_{\frac{r}{4}}(Y)$ with $Q_{\frac{r}{2^3}}(Z_2)$ to obtain $(u/\beta_1)(Z_2) < \beta_1$, i.e., $\forall Z_2 \in Q_{\frac{r}{4}}(Y)$, $u(Z_2) < \beta_1^2$ provided $\mu^{(2)} \leq (2^{n+2})^{-2}\mu$ in the first growth lemma. We can do this process inductively. For any $\beta_0 \in (0,1)$, we can find $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\beta_1^m < \beta_0$, we choose $\mu^{(m)} \leq (2^{n+2})^{-m}\mu$. After we do the above process m times, we conclude that $\forall Z_m \in Q_{\frac{r}{2^m}}(Y)$, $u(Z_m) < \beta_1^m < \beta_0$. In particular, we infer that

$$u(Y) \leq \beta_0 \mathcal{M}_r(Y).$$

Proof. Since every quantity is scaling invariant, we can assume $r = 1$. And we can multiply u by a constant, so without loss of generality, we can also assume $\mathcal{M}_1(Y) = 1$. Also we assume $u(Y) > 0$, otherwise the result is trivial.

Step 1: We show the first growth theorem holds for $\left(\|b\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty(Q)}\right)^n \leq s_0 := s_0(\beta_1, n, \nu) < S$, where s_0 is small enough. Consider

$$v(X) = v(x,t) = u(x,t) + t - s - |x-y|^2 \tag{3.33}$$

in $Q := \{v > 0\} \cap Q_1(Y)$. Clearly, $Q \neq \emptyset$ since $v(Y) = u(Y) > 0$ and $Y \in \partial Q_1(Y)$. It is easy to see that $v \leq u$ in Q. By the measure condition, we obtain

$$|Q| \leq |\{u > 0\} \cap Q_1(Y)| \leq \mu |Q_1(Y)| \leq \mu.$$

Note that $v \le 0$ on $\partial_p Q_1(Y)$, so $v = 0$ on $\partial_p Q$. Since $-u_t + Lu \ge 0$, we obtain

$$(-\partial_t + L)v \ge 0 - 1 - 2trace(a_{ij}) - 2|b| \ge -1 - 2nv^{-1} - 2|b|. \tag{3.34}$$

By the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate,

$$u(Y) \le N(\nu, n, S) \left\| -1 - 2nv^{-1} - 2|b| \right\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty(Q)} \le N_1(\nu, n, S) \left(\mu^{\frac{1}{n}} + s_0^{\frac{1}{n}} \right). \tag{3.35}$$

Fix a $\beta_1 \in (0,1)$, let $s_1^{\frac{1}{n}} := \frac{\beta_1}{2N_1}$, then let $s_0 < s_1$ and $\mu < s_1^n$. Then we obtain

$$u(Y) < \beta_1. \tag{3.36}$$

STEP 2: We follow the spirit in [S10] to find a region, such that the drift over it is small.

By the above discussion, we can choose s_1 from STEP 1. Now just for convenience, we translate Y to $(0,0)$. We divide $[B_1(0) \times (-1,0)] \setminus \left[B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0) \times (-1,0) \right]$ into m pieces of cylindrical shells where $m = [\frac{S}{s_1}] + 1$. If we denote $r_k = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{k}{m}$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots m$, each of those shells is of the form

$$V_k = \left(B_{r_k}(0) \backslash B_{r_{k-1}}(0) \right) \times (-1, 0)$$

where $k = 1, \dots m$. Then at least on one of these shells, say, V_{k_0}, such that $\|b\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty(V_{k_0})} \le s_1$, i.e. the norm of the drift is small over V_{k_0} is small. For any $|y_{k_0}| \in \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{k_0}{m} - \frac{3}{8}\frac{1}{m}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{k_0}{m} - \frac{1}{8}\frac{1}{m} \right]$, and $\forall t_0 \in \left[-1 + \frac{1}{(8m)^2}, 0 \right]$, denote $Y_0 = (y_{k_0}, t_0)$. Then $Q_{\frac{1}{8m}}(Y_0) \subset Q_1(Y)$. Now we take $\mu' \le \left(\frac{1}{8m}\right)^{n+2} \mu$ where μ is from the calculation in STEP 1 to get

$$u(Y_0) < \beta_1. \tag{3.37}$$

STEP 3: Now we can apply the preliminary comparison results to $v = 1 - u$. From STEP 2, we can find a cylinder shell, in which $u \le \beta_1$. Then we can joint Y and a n-dimensional ball in this region with a slanted cylinder. More precisely, from STEP 2, we can fix a point Y^0 such that $|y^0| = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{k_0}{m} - \frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{m}$ and a ball $B_{\frac{1}{8m}}(y^0)$. Then we use a slanted cylinder of radius $\frac{1}{8m}$ to joint $B_{\frac{1}{8m}}(y^0)$ and Y. Now apply Lemma 10 to $v = 1 - u$. We notice the quantity K in Lemma 10 in this situation is bounded above, independent of u, and the upper bound only depends on m. Clearly, $v \ge 1 - \beta_1 =: \ell$ on the bottom, then Lemma 10 gives

$$v(Y) = 1 - u(Y) \ge C(n, v, S, K)(1 - \beta_1).$$

So we can conclude that

$$u(Y) \le 1 - C(n, v, S, K)(1 - \beta_1) =: \beta < 1. \tag{3.38}$$

Finally, by remarks 13 and 14, we are done. □

Remark 15. For other scaling invariant drift cases, i.e.,

$$\left(\int \left[\int |b(x,t)|^q \, dt \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty$$

for some constants p, $q \ge 1$ such that

$$\frac{n}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 1, \ q < \infty.$$

The first growth theorem is easier to show. After rescaling and do translation again, we may still assume $r = 1$ and $Y = 0$. Similarly as above, we know when β_1 is fixed, the fist growth theorem holds when the norm of the drift b is small norm, say, $\|b\|_{L_x^p L_t^q} < s_1$. Similarly as STEP 2 above, we can find cylinder shell over which the drift is small, and over this region $u(Y^0) < \beta_1$. Next we divide $Q_1(0)$ evenly along t direction to m^2 pieces. i.e. each shell is of the form $U_k = B_1(0) \times [-\frac{k}{(8m)^2}, -\frac{k-1}{(8m)^2}]$, for m large (say, here m is larger than the number $m = [\frac{S}{s_1}] + 1$), we can find at least over one of U_k's, say, U_{j_0}

$$\|b\|_{L_x^p L_t^q(U_{j_0})} < s_1.$$

Now for $(y_{j_0}, t_{j_0} = \frac{j_0}{(8m)^2})$, we can build a parabolic cylinder $Q_{\frac{1}{8m}}\left(y_{j_0}, \frac{j_0}{(8m)^2}\right)$. Over this cylinder, by STEP 1, we know

$$u(y_{j_0}, t_{j_0}) < \beta_1.$$

The above estimate holds for $y_{j_0} \in B_{1-\frac{1}{8m}}(0)$. Finally, we apply the maximal principle and STEP 2 above, we have

$$u(y, s) = u(Y) < \beta_1.$$

4. Second Growth Theorem

The slanted cylinder lemma, i.e., Lemma 11 above plays a crucial role in this section to build a connection between different time slides. The second growth theorem helps us control the oscillation between different time slides. We follow the arguments in [FS].

Theorem 16 (Second Growth Theorem)**.** Let a function $u \in C^{2,1}\left(\overline{Q_r}\right)$, where $Q_r := Q_r(Y)$, $Y := (y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $r > 0$, and let $-u_t + Lu \geq 0$ in Q_r. In addition, suppose $u \leq 0$ on $D_\rho := B_\rho(z) \times \{\tau\}$, where $B_\rho(z) \subset B_r(y)$ and

$$s - r^2 \leq \tau \leq s - \frac{1}{4}r^2 - \rho^2. \tag{4.1}$$

Then

$$u(Y) \leq \beta_3 \sup_{Q_r(Y)} u_+ \tag{4.2}$$

where $\beta_3 := \beta_3(n, \nu, \rho/r, S) < 1$ is a constant.

Proof. After rescaling and translation in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we reduce our problem to $r = 1$, and $(z, \tau) = (0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. For an arbitrary point $Y' \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}(Y)$, we can apply the slanted cylinder lemma to the slanted cylinder $V_\rho(Y') \subset Q_1(Y)$. Note that in this situation, the constant K in slanted cylinder lemma only depends on ρ. Therefore, with the parameter β_2 from the slanted cylinder lemma, we have

$$u(Y') \leq \beta_2 \sup_{V_\rho(Y')} u_+ \leq \beta_2 \sup_{Q_1(Y)} u_+.$$

The above estimate holds for all $Y' \in Q_{\frac{1}{2}}(Y)$. Then, in particular, we obtain

$$\sup_{Q_{\frac{1}{2}}(Y)} u_+ \leq \beta_2 \sup_{Q_1(Y)} u_+.$$

□

Now we establish an estimate similar to above with more explicit dependence of the constant on the ratio ρ/r.

Lemma 17. *Let a function $v \in C^{2,1}\left(\overline{Q_r}\right)$ satisfy $v \geq 0$, $-v_t + Lv \leq 0$ in $Q_r := Q_r(Y), Y = (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, r > 0$. For arbitrary disks $D_\rho := B_\rho(z) \times \{\tau\}$ and $D^0 := B_{\frac{r}{2}}(y) \times \{\sigma\}$, such that $B_\rho(z) \subset B_r(y)$ and*

$$s - r^2 \leq \tau < \tau + h^2 r^2 \leq \sigma \leq s, \tag{4.3}$$

where $h \in (0,1)$ is a constant. Then we conclude that

$$\inf_{D_\rho} v \leq \left(\frac{2r}{\rho}\right)^\gamma \inf_{D^0} v \tag{4.4}$$

where $\gamma = \gamma(n, \nu, h, S)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume $m := \inf_{D_\rho} v > 0$, $r = 1$, $z = 0$, $\tau = 0$, $\sigma = s = h^2$. So $D_\rho = B_\rho(0) \times \{0\}$. We can apply an additional linear transformation along t-axis, we can also reduce the proof to the case $h = 1$. Now fix the integer k such that $2^{-k-1} < \rho \leq 2^{-k}$, and for $j = 0, 1, \ldots$, and we define $y^j := y^* + 2^{-j}(y - y^*)$, $B^j := B_{2^{-j}}(y^j)$, where $y^* := \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} y$, $Y^j := \left(y^j, 4^{-j}\right)$, $Q^j := Q_{2^{-j}}(Y^j)$, $D^j := B_{2^{-j-1}}(y^j) \times \{4^{-j}\}$. By construction, $0 = y^* + \rho(y - y^*)$, so that

$$B_\rho(0),\, B^j \in \{B_\theta(y^* + \theta(y - y^*);\, 0 \leq \theta \leq 1\}.$$

Then by the assumption, $B_\rho(0) \subset B_1(y)$ it follows $|y| \leq 1 - \rho$, $|y - y^*| \leq 1$, and

$$B^{k+1} \subset B_\rho(0) \subset B^k \subset B^{k-1} \subset \ldots \subset B^1 \subset B^0 = B_1(y).$$

Apply Theorem 16 to the function $u = 1 - \frac{1}{m} v$ in Q^k with

$$r = 2^{-k},\ \rho = 2^{-k-1},\ Y = Y^k,\ z = 0,\ \tau = 0.$$

Then we conclude that

$$\sup_{D_k} u \leq \sup_{Q_{2^{-k-1}}(Y^k)} u \leq \beta_3 \sup_{Q^k} u \leq \beta_3 = \beta_2(n, \nu, S, \frac{1}{2}) < 1,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\inf_{D_\rho} v = m \leq (1 - \beta_3)^{-1} \inf_{D^k} v = 2^\gamma \inf_{D^k} v,$$

where $\gamma := -\log_2(1 - \beta_3) > 0$. Similarly, if $k \geq 1$, we also have

$$\inf_{D^j} v \leq 2^\gamma \inf_{D^{j-1}} v,$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. Finally we obtain

$$\inf_{D_\rho} v \leq 2^\gamma \inf_{D^k} v \leq 2^{2\gamma} \inf_{D^{k-1}} v \leq \ldots \leq 2^{(k+1)\gamma} \inf_{D^0} v \leq \left(\frac{2r}{\rho}\right)^\gamma \inf_{D^0} v.$$

□

5. Third Growth Theorem

The first growth theorem tells us if $\mu \to 0^+$ then $\beta_1 \to 0^+$. The third growth theorem tells us if we have a nice control of the measure of the set $\{u > 0\}$ near the bottom, then we can have a more precise estimate. In other words, if we have the similar measure condition for

$$Q^0 := Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y^0), Y^0 = \left(y, s - \frac{3}{4}r^2\right).$$

Then if $\mu < 1$, then $\beta_1 < 1$. In order to carry out the third growth theorem, we need a covering lemma. We proceed as in [FS].

Lemma 18. *Let a constant $\mu_0 \in (0,1)$ be a fixed number. For an arbitrary measurable set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with finite Lebesgue measure $|\Gamma|$, we introduce the family of cylinders*

$$\mathcal{A} := \{Q = Q_r(Y) : |Q \cap \Gamma| \geq (1-\mu_0)|Q|\}. \tag{5.1}$$

Then the open set $E := \cup_{Q\in\mathcal{A}} Q$ satisfies,

$$|\Gamma \backslash E| = 0, \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$|E| \geq q_0 |\Gamma|, \ q_0 := 1 + 3^{-n-1}\mu_0 > 1. \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. From the fact that almost every point of Γ is a point of density, we have $|\Gamma\backslash E| = 0$. More precisely, suppose $|\Gamma\backslash E| > 0$, then we can choose a cylinder $Q^* := B_{\frac{1}{m}}(y) \times (s - \frac{1}{m}, s)$, with some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|Q^* \cap (\Gamma\backslash E)| \geq (1-\mu_0)|Q^*|. \tag{5.4}$$

Notice that Q^* is a union of m disjoint parabolic cylinders

$$Q_k^* := B_{\frac{1}{m}}(y) \times \left(s - \frac{k+1}{m^2}, s - \frac{k}{m^2}\right), \ k = 0, 1, \ldots, m-1,$$

therefore the above inequality (5.4) must be true for some Q_k^* instead of Q^*. Then $Q_k^* \in \mathcal{A}$, $Q_k^* \subset E$, $Q_k^* \cap (\Gamma\backslash E)$ is empty and of course the above inequality can not be true for Q_k^*. Therefore we have $|\Gamma\backslash E| = 0$.

Now, for each $Q = Q_r(Y) \in \mathcal{A}$ with $|Q \cap \Gamma| \geq (1-\mu_0)|Q|$, we continuously increase r such that we achieve the exact equality, i.e., $|Q \cap \Gamma| = (1-\mu_0)|Q|$. Therefore, we can write

$$E := \cup_{Q\in A_0} Q, \ \ \mathcal{A}_0 := \{Q = Q_r(Y) : |Q \cap \Gamma| = (1-\mu_0)|Q|\}.$$

Next, we follow the well-known argument in the classical Vitali covering lemma with parabolic cylinders instead of balls or cubes. We construct an at most countable sequence of cylinders Q^k, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ as follows: we denote

$$R_1 := \sup\{r : \ Q_r(Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0\}.$$

By an easy compactness argument gives us that this supremum is obtained for some cylinder $Q_{R_1}(Y_1) \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Define $Q^1 := Q_{R_1}(Y_1)$. Now assume that $Q^i := Q_{R_i}(Y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ have been selected for some $k \geq 1$, we set

$$\mathcal{A}_{k+1} := \left\{Q = Q_r(Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \ Q \cap Q^i = \emptyset, \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, k\right\}.$$

If $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}$ is nonempty, then we denote

$$R_{k+1} := \sup\{r : \ Q_r(Y) \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}\}$$

this supremum is obtained for $Q^{k+1} := Q_{R_{k+1}}(Y_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}$.

In the case when all of the sets $\mathcal{A}_0 \supset \mathcal{A}_1 \supset \mathcal{A}_2 \supset \dots$ are nonempty, we get a countable sequence of cylinder $Q^i = Q_{R_i}(Y_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$. If however $\mathcal{A}_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $\mathcal{A}_{k+1} = \emptyset$, then we have a finite sequence of cylinders Q^i,$i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. In the latter case we set, by definition, $R_{k+1} = R_{k+1} = \dots = 0$. Clearly, by our construction, the cylinders Q^i are pairwise disjoint, $R_1 \geq R_2 \geq \dots$, and $R_i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$.

Take an arbitrary cylinder $Q_r(Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$. We have $R_1 \geq R_2 \geq \dots \geq R_k \geq r > R_{k+1}$ for some integer $k \geq 1$. Since $r > R^{k+1}$, the cylinder $Q_r(Y)$ does not belong to $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}$ and therefore $Q_r(Y) \cap Q^i \neq \emptyset$ for some $i \leq k$. Since $r < R_i$, this implies $Q_r(Y) \subset \tilde{Q}^i$, where

$$\tilde{Q} := B_{3\rho} \times (s - 2\rho^2, s + \rho^2)$$

for

$$Q = Q_\rho(z, s) = B_\rho \times (s - \rho^2, s).$$

Therefore for arbitrary $Q_r(Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ is a subset of $\tilde{Q}^i$ for some $i \geq 1$. Then we have

$$E \subset \cup_i \tilde{Q}^i, \ |E| \leq \sum_i \left|\tilde{Q}^i\right| = 3^{n+1} \sum_i \left|Q^i\right|.$$

On the other hand since $Q^i \in \mathcal{A}_0$ are pairwise disjoint,

$$|E \backslash \Gamma| \geq \sum_i \left|(E \backslash \Gamma) \cap Q^i\right| = \mu_0 \sum_i \left|Q^i\right|.$$

Then with the above two relations, we obtain

$$\frac{|E|}{|\Gamma|} = 1 + \frac{|E \backslash \Gamma|}{|\Gamma|} \geq 1 + \frac{|E \backslash \Gamma|}{|E|} \geq 1 + \frac{\mu_0}{3^{n+1}} = q_0 > 1.$$

Therefore

$$|E| \geq q_0 |\Gamma|.$$

□

Now we consider the change of measures after we shift cylinders with respect to certain rule, which will be helpful when we prove the third growth theorem. The lemma below seems trivial but we need to be cautious. The way a cylinder shifted depends on the size and the position of the cylinder,so some originally overlapped cylinders might be disjoint after we shift them, or vice versa.

Lemma 19. *For a fixed constant $K_1 > 1$ and any standard cylinder $Q = Q_r(Y) = B_r(y) \times (s - r^2, s)$, we denote $\hat{Q} := B_r(y) \times (s + r^2, s + K_1 r^2)$. Then for an arbitrary family of standard cylinders, the $n + 1$ dimensional Lebesgue measures of the sets*

$$E := \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} Q \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\hat{E} := \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} \hat{Q} \tag{5.6}$$

have the following quantitative relation:

$$\left|\hat{E}\right| \geq q_1 |E|, \ q_1 := \frac{K_1 - 1}{K_1 + 1}. \tag{5.7}$$

Proof. By Fubini's theorem, we obtain

$$|E| = \int |E_x|\, dx, \ \ \left|\hat{E}\right| = \int \left|\hat{E}_x\right| dx$$

where we use the standard notation for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$E_x := \{t \in \mathbb{R} : (x,t) \in E\}, \ \ \hat{E}_x := \left\{t \in \mathbb{R} : (x,t) \in \hat{E}\right\}.$$

Now we see it suffices to show $\left|\hat{E}_x\right| \geq q_1 |E_x|$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then everything is reduced to one-dimensional topology.

Now fix an x such that E_x is not empty. Then for this fixed x the open set $\hat{E}_x$ is a union of disjoint open intervals $\hat{I}_k$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots,$. Here we use the basic fact from 1-D topology about the structure of open sets. If $t \in E_x$, then $(x,t) \in Q_r = B_r(y) \times (s - r^2, s)$ for some cylinder $Q_r \in \mathcal{A}$, and $(s + r^2, s + K_1 r^2) \subset \hat{I}_k$ for some k. Then clearly, $r^2 \leq r_k^2 := (K_1 - 1)^{-1} \left|\hat{I}_k\right|$. We can also choose s_k such that $\hat{I}_k = (s_k + r_k^2, s_k + K_1 r_k^2)$ by our construction. Then, we observe that

$$s_k + r_k^2 \leq s + r^2, \ \ s_k - r_k^2 \leq s - r^2.$$

The first inequality is trivial, and the second one follows from the fact $r_k \geq r$ by the construction. Therefore,

$$t \in (s - r^2, s) \subset J_k := (s_k - r_k^2, s_k + K_1 r_k^2).$$

Hence we get

$$E_x \subset \cup J_k,$$

which implies

$$q_1 |E_x| \leq q_1 |\cup J_k| \leq q_1 \sum_k |J_k| = \sum_k \left|\hat{I}_k\right| = \left|\hat{E}_x\right|.$$

So we conclude that

$$\left|\hat{E}\right| \geq q_1 |E|.$$

□

Theorem 20 (Third Growth Theorem)**.** *Let a function $u \in C^{2,1}\left(\overline{Q_r}\right)$, where $Q_r = Q_r(Y)$, $Y = (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $r > 0$, and let $-u_t + Lu \geq 0$ in Q_r. In addition, we assume*

$$\left|\{u > 0\} \cap Q^0\right| \leq \mu \left|Q^0\right|, \tag{5.8}$$

where

$$Q^0 := Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y^0), \ Y^0 = \left(y, s - \frac{3}{4} r^2\right) \tag{5.9}$$

and $\mu < 1$ is a constant. Then we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y) \leq \beta \mathcal{M}_r(Y) \tag{5.10}$$

with a constant

$$\beta := \beta(n, \nu, S, \mu) < 1.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may rescale and translate our problem so that $r = 2$, $Y = (y, s) = (0, 0)$. Now under this setting, $Q^0 = B_1(0) \times (-4, -3)$ and $\left|Q^0\right| = |B_1(0)|$, which only depends on n.

Now consider $\Gamma := \{u \le 0\} \cap Q^0$. Then from the above measure condition, we have

$$|\Gamma| \ge (1-\mu)\left|Q^0\right| = (1-\mu)\,|B_1(0)| =: c_0 = c_0(\mu, n) > 0. \tag{5.11}$$

From the first growth theorem, we know the constant $\beta_1 = \beta_1(n, \nu, S, \mu) \to 0^+$ as $\mu \to 0^+$. So we can find a constant $\mu_0 = \mu_0(n, \nu, S) \in (0, 1)$ such that the first growth theorem holds for a constant $\beta_1 \le \frac{1}{2}$. With this constant μ_0 and Γ, we perform the covering lemma, Lemma 18, to obtain a family of cylinders $\mathcal{A}$ defined by the formula in the above lemma. Then by the results from the above lemmas, if we denote $E := \cup_{Q\in\mathcal{A}} Q$, then we obtain

$$|\Gamma \backslash E| = 0,$$

and

$$|E| \ge q_0\,|\Gamma|\,,\ q_0 := 1 + 3^{-n-1}\mu_0 > 1. \tag{5.12}$$

Denote $\epsilon_0 := 3^{-n-2}\mu_0$, i.e., $q_0 = 1 + 3\epsilon_0$. Now choose constant $K_1 > 0$ such that

$$q_1 := \frac{K_1 - 1}{K_1 + 1} = \frac{1 + 2\epsilon_0}{1 + 3\epsilon_0}, \tag{5.13}$$

i.e.,

$$K_1 = K_1(n, \nu, S) = 5 + 2\epsilon_0^{-1}.$$

By the above two lemmas, we conclude that

$$\left|\hat{E}\right| \ge q_1\,|E| \ge q_0 q_1\,|\Gamma| = (1 + 2\epsilon_0)\,|\Gamma|\,. \tag{5.14}$$

In order to have some estimate of the size of the cylinders in the family $\mathcal{A}$, we introduce another cylinder Q^1 such that

$$Q^0 \subset Q^1,\ \left|Q^1 \backslash Q^0\right| \le \epsilon_0 c_0,\ dist\left(Q^0, \partial Q^1\right) \ge c_1 = c_1(n, \nu, \mu).$$

Then there are two possibilities about $\hat{E}$ and Q^1. (a) $\hat{E}\backslash Q^1 \neq \emptyset$ and (b) $\hat{E}\backslash Q^1 = \emptyset$.

(a) If $\hat{E}\backslash Q^1 \neq \emptyset$, this can only be true if there are some cylinders $Q \in \mathcal{A}$ which are large enough, i.e., there exists $Q = Q_r(Y) \in \mathcal{A}$ with $r \ge r_0 = r_0(n, \nu, \mu) > 0$. Notice that

$$|\{u > 0\} \cap Q| \le |Q \backslash \Gamma| \le \mu_0\,|Q|\,, \tag{5.15}$$

for $Q \in \mathcal{A}$. By the first growth theorem and the choice of μ_0, we have

$$\sup_{Q_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y)} u \le \frac{1}{2} \sup_{Q_r(Y)} u_+ \le \frac{1}{2} M, \tag{5.16}$$

for $Q = Q_r(Y) \in A$ where

$$M := \sup_{Q_r(0)} u_+.$$

Therefore,

$$u - \frac{1}{2} M \le 0$$

on $D := B_{\frac{r}{2}}(Y) \times \{s\}$ for $Q_r(Y) \in \mathcal{A}$, $Y = (y, s)$. Now we apply the second growth theorem to $u - \frac{1}{2}M$ with $\rho = \frac{1}{2}r_0$. By the theorem, we obtain $u - \frac{1}{2}M \in \mathcal{M}(\beta_2, 0, 2)$ with $\beta_2 = \beta_2(n, \nu, S, \mu) < 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Q_1} u &= \frac{1}{2}M + \sup_{Q_1}\left(u - \frac{1}{2}M\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}M + \beta_2 \sup_{Q_2}\left(u - \frac{1}{2}M\right)_+ \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \beta_2\right)M, \end{aligned}$$

and $u \in \mathcal{M}(\beta_0, 0, 2)$ with $\beta_0 = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \beta_2\right) < 1$.

(b) If $\hat{E} \backslash Q^1 = \emptyset$, then $\hat{E} \subset Q^1$, and by the measure relations, if we set $\Gamma_1 := \hat{E} \cap Q^0$, then Γ_1 satisfies

$$|\Gamma_1| = \left|\hat{E} \cap Q^0\right| \geq \left|\hat{E}\right| - \left|Q^1 \backslash Q^0\right| \geq (1 + 2\epsilon_0)\,|\Gamma| - \epsilon_0 c_0 \geq (1 + \epsilon_0)\,|\Gamma|\,. \tag{5.17}$$

From the above argument in case (a), we know that $\forall Q \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $u \leq \beta_0 M$ on $\hat{Q}$ with $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, \nu, S, \mu) < 1$. Since the sets $\hat{Q}$ cover Γ_1, we know $u \leq \beta_0 M$ on Γ_1. Therefore,

$$\left|\{u \leq \beta_0 M\} \cap Q^0\right| \geq (1 + \epsilon_0)\left|\{u \leq 0\} \cap Q^0\right|. \tag{5.18}$$

Now we have proved that either (a) $u \leq \beta_0 M$ on Q_1, or in case (b) u satisfies the measure relation $\left|\{u \leq \beta_0 M\} \cap Q^0\right| \geq (1 + \epsilon_0)\left|\{u \leq 0\} \cap Q^0\right|$. Now we proceed recursively starting from

$$u_0 := u,\ M_0 := M, \tag{5.19}$$

and define

$$u_{k+1} := u_k - \beta_0 M_k,\ M_{k+1} := \sup_{Q_r} u_{k+1} \tag{5.20}$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Then we can easily derive that $\forall k$

$$u_k = u - \left[1 - (1 - \beta_0)^k\right] M,\ M_k = (1 - \beta_0)^k M. \tag{5.21}$$

If case (b) holds for all u_k with $k = 0, 1, 2 \ldots, m - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \left|Q^0\right| &\geq \left|\{u_m \leq 0\} \cap Q^0\right| \\ &= \left|\{u_{m-1} \leq \beta_0 M_{m-1}\} \cap Q^0\right| \\ &\geq (1 + \epsilon_0)\left|\{u_{m-1} \leq 0\} \cap Q^0\right| \\ &\geq \\ &\vdots \\ &\geq (1 + \epsilon_0)^m \left|\{u_0 \leq 0\} \cap Q^0\right| \\ &\geq (1 + \epsilon_0)^m c_0. \end{aligned}$$

If now, we take $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(1 + \epsilon_0)^m c_0 > \left|Q^0\right|$, then (b) fails for some u_k with $k \leq m - 1$. Therefore, we have

$$u_m \leq u_{k+1} \leq 0,$$

and

$$u \leq \left[1 - (1 - \beta_0)^m\right] M \tag{5.22}$$

on Q_1. We can conclude that

$$u \in \mathcal{M}(\beta, 0, 2)$$

with

$$\beta := 1 - (1 - \beta_0)^m < 1. \tag{5.23}$$

□

Corollary 21. *Let a function $v \in C^{2,1}\left(\overline{Q_r}\right)$ be such that $v \geq 0$, and $-v_t + Lv \leq 0$ in Q_r, and*

$$\left|\{v \geq 1\} \cap Q^0\right| > (1 - \mu)\left|Q^0\right|. \tag{5.24}$$

Then

$$v \geq 1 - \beta > 0 \tag{5.25}$$

on $Q_{\frac{r}{2}}$, where $\beta = \beta(n, \nu, \mu, S) < 1$ for $\mu < 1$.

The corollary basically tells us quantitatively that if v is large in a large region of a cylinder, then v is large in half of the cylinder. We can notice the above corollary is much more precise than the intermediate comparison results in section for the first growth thereom.

Proof. We can rescale our problem again, and assume $r = 2$. Then the function $u = 1 - v$ satisfies $-u_t + Lu \geq 0$ in Q_2, and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\{u > 0\} \cap Q^0\right| &= \left|\{v < 1\} \cap Q^0\right| = \left|Q^0\right| - \left|\{v \geq 1\} \cap Q^0\right| \\ &\leq \left|Q^0\right| - (1 - \mu)\left|Q^0\right| \leq \mu\left|Q^0\right|.\end{aligned}$$

Then we can apply the third growth theorem to u, we obtain

$$\sup_{Q_1} u \leq \beta \sup_{Q_2(X_0)} u_+ \leq \beta,$$

and

$$\inf_{Q_1} v = 1 - \sup_{Q_1} u \geq 1 - \beta.$$

□

6. Interior Harnack Inequality

With the first growth theorem, we can do the following useful argument, which is helpful for us to find a non-degenerate point to build a bridge between two regions we are interested in. Without loss of generality, we still assume $r = 1$, for $X \in Q_1(Y)$, we define

$$d(X) := \sup\left\{\rho > 0 : \, Q_\rho(X) \subset Q_1(Y)\right\}. \tag{6.1}$$

Roughly here d plays roles of weights with which we can make sure the point we are interested in is not degenerate, i.e., it is in the interior of the cylinder. For $\gamma > 0$, we consider $d^\gamma u(x)$ instead of $u(x)$. $d^\gamma u(x)$ is a continuous function in $\overline{Q_1(Y)}$. Clearly, $d(Y) = 1$, we have

$$u(Y) = d^\gamma u(Y) \leq M := \sup_{Q_1(Y)} d^\gamma u. \tag{6.2}$$

By our construction, $d^\gamma u$ vanishes on $\partial_p Q_1$, so $\exists X_0 \in \overline{Q_1(Y)} \backslash \partial_p Q_1$ such that

$$M = d^\gamma u(X_0). \tag{6.3}$$

Let $r_0 := \frac{1}{2}d(X_0)$, we consider the intermediate region $Q_{r_0}(X_0)$. In this region, we have

$$\forall X \in Q_{r_0}(X_0),\ d(X) \geq r_0.$$

Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\sup_{Q_{r_0}(X_0)} u \leq r_0^{-\gamma} \sup_{Q_{r_0}(X_0)} d^\gamma u \leq r_0^{-\gamma} M \leq 2^\gamma u(X_0). \tag{6.4}$$

Now, we define $v = u - \frac{1}{2}u(X_0)$, then

$$v(X_0) = \frac{1}{2}u(X_0) \geq 2^{-1-\gamma} \sup_{Q_{r_0}(X_0)} u > 2^{-1-\gamma} \sup_{Q_{r_0}(X_0)} v.$$

From Theorem 12, we know $\exists \mu(n, \nu, \gamma, S) \in (0, 1]$ such that the first growth theorem holds with $\beta_1 = 2^{-1-\gamma}$. Now the above inequality tells us that v does not satisfy the measure condition in the first growth theorem. So

$$|\{v > 0\} \cap Q_{r_0}(X_0)| = \left| \left\{ u > \frac{1}{2}u(X_0) \right\} \cap Q_{r_0}(X_0) \right| > \mu \left| Q_{r_0}(X_0) \right|. \tag{6.5}$$

With the above preparation, we are ready to prove the interior Harnack inequality.

Theorem (Interior Harnack Inequality)**.** *Suppose $u \in C^{2,1}(Q_{2r}(Y)) \cap C(\overline{Q_{2r}(Y)})$ and $-u_t + Lu = 0$ in $Q_{2r}(Y)$, $Y = (y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $r > 0$. If $u \geq 0$, then*

$$\sup_{Q^0} u \leq N \inf_{Q_r} u, \tag{6.6}$$

where $N = N(n, \nu, S)$ and $Q^0 = B_r(y) \times (s - 3r^2, s - 2r^2)$.

We will build a non-degenerate intermediate region to get a quantitative relation between two regions we are interested in with the help of three growth theorems.

Proof. After rescaling and translating as necessary, we can assume $Y = 0$ and $r = 1$. Now $Q_1 = B_1(0) \times (-1, 0)$, $Q^0 = B_1(0) \times (-3, -2)$. It is easy to see that if we define $d(X) := \sup\{\rho > 0 :\ Q_\rho(X) \subset Q_2(0)\}$, then $d(X) \geq 1$ in Q^0. Hence, if we consider $Q^1 := B_2(0) \times (-3, -2)$ we have

$$\sup_{Q^0} u \leq M := \sup_{Q^1} d^\gamma u, \tag{6.7}$$

where γ is chosen at the same as the γ in Lemma 17 with $h = \frac{1}{2}$. From the above discussion, we can find $\exists X_0 \in \overline{Q^1} \backslash \left[\partial_p Q^1 \cap \partial_p Q_2\right]$ such that

$$d^\gamma u(X_0) = M. \tag{6.8}$$

Similarly as above, we define

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4}d(X_0) \in (0, \frac{1}{2}], \tag{6.9}$$

and

$$Q_0 = Q_\rho(X_0) \cap \left\{ u > \frac{1}{2}u(X_0) \right\}. \tag{6.10}$$

By the above discussion, we conclude that

$$|Q_0| > \mu_1 \left| Q_\rho(X_0) \right|$$

for some constant $\mu_1 = \mu_1(n, \nu, S, \gamma) > 0$. Now we apply Corollary 21 with

$$v = \frac{2}{u(X_0)}u,\ Q_r = Q_{2\rho}(Y_0),\ Y_0 = (x_0, t_0 + 3\rho^2),\ Q^0 = Q_\rho(X_0),\ 1 - \mu = \mu_1.$$

Then we have

$$u \geq \beta u(X_0) \tag{6.11}$$

on $Q_\rho(Y_0)$ with $\beta = \beta(n, \nu, S) > 0$. Next we apply Lemma 17 with

$$v = u,\ r = 2,\ D_\rho = B_\rho(x_0) \times \{t_0 + 2\rho^2\} \subset \overline{Q_\rho(Y_0)},$$

and

$$D^0 = B_1(0) \times \{\tau\},\ \forall \tau \in (-1, 0).$$

So we obtain

$$\beta u(X_0) \leq \inf_{D_\rho} u \leq \left(\frac{4}{\rho}\right)^\gamma \inf_{Q_1(0)} u. \tag{6.12}$$

Finally, with the help of the intermediate region, we conclude that

$$\sup_{Q^0} u \leq M = d^\gamma u(X_0) = (4\rho)^\gamma\, u(X_0) \leq \beta^{-1} 4^{2\gamma} \inf_{Q_1(0)} u. \tag{6.13}$$

Taking $N = N(n, \nu, S) = \beta^{-1} 4^{2\gamma}$ gives the desired result. □

It is well-known that it is easy to derive the Hölder continuity of solutions from the Harnack inequality by standard oscillation and iteration arguments.

Theorem 22. *If $u \in W(Q_r)$ and is a solution of $-u_t + Lu = 0$ in Q_r, then u is Hölder continuous in $Q_{\frac{r}{2}}$.*

7. Approximation

In all the proofs from above sections, we always assume u is $C^{2,1}$. In this section, we briefly show we can use an approximation argument to show that all results hold for $u \in W(Q_{2r}) = W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}(Q_{2r}) \cap C(\overline{Q_{2r}})$, where $u \in W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}(Q_{2r})$ means u_t, $D_i u$, $D_{ij} u \in (L^n_x L^\infty_t)_{loc}$. Throughout, we assume

$$u \geq 0,\ -u_t + Lu = -u_t + \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u + \sum_i b_i D_i u = 0 \tag{7.1}$$

in Q_{2r}. We can approximate a_{ij}, b_i and u by smooth functions $a^\epsilon_{ij} \to a_{ij}$, $b^\epsilon_i \to b_i$ a.e. as $\epsilon \to 0^+$. And $u^\epsilon \to u$ in $W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}$ as $\epsilon \to 0^+$. Then

$$f^\epsilon = -u^\epsilon_t + L^\epsilon u^\epsilon = -u^\epsilon_t + \sum_{ij} a^\epsilon_{ij} D_{ij} u^\epsilon + \sum_i b^\epsilon_i D_i u^\epsilon \to 0 \tag{7.2}$$

in $(L^n_x L^\infty_t)_{loc}(Q_{2r})$ as $\epsilon \to 0^+$. With the existence of solution to for equations with smooth coefficients, therefore we can write

$$u^\epsilon = v^\epsilon + w^\epsilon,$$

where

$$-v^\epsilon_t + L^\epsilon v^\epsilon = 0$$

in Q_{2r} and

$$v^\epsilon = u^\epsilon$$

on $\partial_p Q_{2r}$:

$$-w^\epsilon_t + L^\epsilon w^\epsilon = f^\epsilon,$$

$$w^\epsilon = 0$$

on $\partial_p Q_{2r}$. By the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate, we know $w^\epsilon \to 0$ in L^∞ and v^ϵ satisfies the Harnack inequality. Finally, by an easy limiting argument, u also satisfies the Harnack inequality.

Remark 23. For other values for p, q for $q < \infty$, the approximation argument for $u \in W^{2,1}_{p,q}(Q_{2r}) \cap C(\overline{Q_{2r}})$ is similar but actually easier from standard results about L^p spaces.

8. Applications

This section, we show some applications of the interior Harnack inequality. We will just formulate some results based on the interior Harnack inequality. In particular the boundary Harnack inequality, the boundary backward Harnack inequality, and the Hölder continuity of quotients. The detailed proofs are provided [FSY]. And one can find more details on applications of the interior Harnack inequality in [FSY, S98]. We start with some additional basic notations in order to formulate our results.

For $X = (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $r > 0$, a standard cylinder is defined as

$$Q_r(X) = Q_r(x,t) = B_r(x) \times (t - r^2, t),$$

where $B_r(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n,\, |y - x| < r\}$. For a constant $\delta > 0$,$\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $Q_\Omega := \Omega \times (0,T)$, we define

$$\Omega^\delta = \{x \in \Omega :\, dist(x, \partial\Omega) > \delta\} = \left\{x \in \Omega :\, \overline{B_\delta}(x) \subset \Omega\right\}, \tag{8.1}$$

$$Q^\delta_\Omega = \Omega^\delta \times (\delta^2, T) = \left\{X \in Q_\Omega :\, \overline{Q_\delta}(X) \subset Q_\Omega\right\}. \tag{8.2}$$

We assume Ω to be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By a Lipschitz domain, we mean there are positive constants r_Ω and m_Ω such that $\forall y \in \partial\Omega$, we can find an orthonormal frame centered at y, in which we have

$$\Omega \cap B_{r_\Omega}(y) = \left\{x = (x', x_n) :\, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1},\, x_n > \phi(x'),\, |x| < r_\Omega\right\}, \tag{8.3}$$

and

$$\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty} \le m_\Omega. \tag{8.4}$$

Also in such coordinates, $y \in \partial\Omega$ is represented as $(0,0)$ and $(0,r) \in \Omega$ for all $r \in (0, r_\Omega]$. For $Q_\Omega = \Omega \times (0,T)$, $Y = (y,s) = (0,0,s) \in \partial_x Q_\Omega = \partial_x\Omega \times (0,T)$, and for $r > 0$, we denote

$$\overline{Y_r} = (0, r, s + r^2),\ \ \underline{Y_r} = (0, r, s - 2r^2), \tag{8.5}$$

For fixed positive constants r_0, R_0 and M_0, we assume our domain Ω satisfies

$$r_\Omega \ge r_0,\ m_\Omega \le M_0,\ diam(\Omega) \le R_0. \tag{8.6}$$

In the most general form, we can state the interior Haranck principle as the following:

Theorem 24. *(Harnack Principle). Suppose $u \in W$ in the sense of Definition 2(??)nd $u \ge 0$ satisfy $-u_t + Lu = 0$ in a bounded domain $Q_\Omega = \Omega \times (0,T)$, constant $\delta > 0$ such that Ω^δ is connected set, $X = (x,t)$, $Y = (y,s) \in Q^\delta_\Omega$, and $s - t \ge \delta^2$. Then*

$$u(X) \le N u(Y), \tag{8.7}$$

where the constant $N = N(n, \nu, S, R_0, T, \delta)$.

Now we can state the theorem on a boundary Harnack inequality. This kind of inequality is also called Carleson type inequality.

Theorem 25. *Let $Y = (y, s) \in \partial_x Q_\Omega$ and $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}\min\left(r_0, \sqrt{T-s}, \sqrt{s}\right)$ be fixed. Then for any non-negative solution $-u_t + Lu = 0$ in $Q_\Omega = \Omega \times (0, T)$, which continuously vanishes on $\Gamma = \partial_x Q_\Omega \cap Q_{2r}(Y)$, we have*

$$M_0 = \sup_{Q_\Omega \cap Q_{2r}(Y)} d_0^\gamma u \le N r^\gamma u(\overline{Y_r}), \tag{8.8}$$

where

$$d_0 = d_0(X) := \sup\left\{\rho > 0 : Q_\rho(X) \subset Q_{2\rho}(Y)\right\},$$

and γ and N are positive constants depending only on n, ν, S and m_Ω. In particular

$$\sup_{Q_\Omega \cap Q_r(Y)} u \le N u(\overline{Y_r}). \tag{8.9}$$

Again, one can find the detailed proof in [FSY]. With our growth theorems and interior Haranck inequality, the remaining steps in the proof are more or less independent of the specific structure of the equations.

We also state a elliptic-type Harnack inequality.

Theorem 26. *Let u be a non-negative solution $-u_t + Lu = 0$ in $Q_\Omega = \Omega \times (0, T)$ which continuously vanishes on $\partial_x Q_\Omega$, and let $0 < \delta \le \frac{1}{2}\min\left(r_0, \sqrt{T}\right)$. Then there exists a positive constant $N = N(n, \nu, S, m_\Omega, r_0, R_0, T, \delta)$, such that*

$$\sup_{Q_\Omega^\delta} \le N \inf_{Q_\Omega^\delta} u. \tag{8.10}$$

Next, the boundary backward Haranck inequality is formulated as follows:

Theorem 27. *Let u be a non-negative solution $-u_t + Lu = 0$ in $Q_\Omega = \Omega \times (0, T)$ which continuously vanishes on $\partial_x Q_\Omega$, and let $\delta > 0$ be a constant. Then there exists a positive constant $N = N(n, \nu, S, M_0, r_0, R_0, T, \delta)$, such that*

$$u(x, s) \le N u(x, t) \tag{8.11}$$

where $T > s \ge t \ge s - d^2 \ge \delta^2 > 0$, $d = dist(x, \partial\Omega)$.

Again interested readers can find details in [FSY].

Finally, we state a result related to the Hölder continuity of quotients.

Theorem 28. *Let u and v be strictly positive solutions $-u_t + Lu = 0$ in $Q_\Omega = \Omega \times (0, \infty)$, vanishing on $Q_{2r}(Y_0) \cap \partial_x Q_\Omega$, where $Y_0 = (y_0, s_0) \in \partial_x Q_\Omega = \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty)$ and $s_0 \ge 4r^2 > 0$. Then $\frac{u}{v}$ is Hölder continuous in $\overline{Q_\Omega \cap Q_r(Y_0)}$.*

8.1. **A universal spectral gap for the elliptic problem.** Given the ellipticity condition and estimates on the coefficients, there is a universal gap in the spectrum of the operator $L = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} + \sum b_i D_i$ between the principal eigenvalue and the rest of the eigenvalues. We first list two results about the Harnack principle for quotients of solutions which are helpful to show the desired spectral gap. As with the applications of interior Harnack inequality above, the proofs are more or less independent of the specific structure of the equations, so we will omit them. The detailed proofs are presented in [HPS1], [HPS2] and [FSY]. We will proceed as in [HPS1].

We consider the following problem for a linear parabolic equation.

$$-u_t + Lu = 0 \tag{8.12}$$

in $\Omega \times I$, and

$$u = 0$$

on $\partial\Omega \times I$, where I is an open interval in $\mathbb{R}$ and $L = \sum_{ij} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_i b_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$ with assumptions (1.2) and (1.6)

Theorem 29. *Let u_1 and u_2 be two real solutions of the above problem* (8.12) *and let $u_1 > 0$ in $Q_\Omega := \Omega \times (s, \infty)$. Then*

$$\sup_{Q_\Omega} \frac{u_2}{u_1} = M(s) := \sup_{\Omega \times \{s\}} \frac{u_2}{u_1}, \tag{8.13}$$

and

$$\inf_{Q_\Omega} \frac{u_2}{u_1} = m(s) := \inf_{\Omega \times \{s\}} \frac{u_2}{u_1}. \tag{8.14}$$

Theorem 30. Let u_1 *and* u_2 *be two positive solutions of the above problem* (8.12) *in the cylinder $Q_\Omega := \Omega \times (s, \infty)$, and let M and m be defined as in the above corollary, then*

$$M(t) \leq N_1 m(t) \tag{8.15}$$

for

$$t \geq s + 1$$

with a constant N_1 depends on n, ν, S, r_0, R_0 and M_0.

Recall the oscillation of a real function can be defined as

$$osc_\Omega f := \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} |f(x) - f(y)| = \sup_\Omega f - \inf_\Omega f. \tag{8.16}$$

For a complex function, we can also define the oscillation, it can be formulated as following:

$$osc_\Omega f := \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} |f(x) - f(y)| = \sup_{0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi} osc_\Omega \Re(e^{i\phi} f). \tag{8.17}$$

Proposition 31. *u_1 and u_2 be two real solutions of the above problem* (8.12) *in the cylinder $Q_\Omega := \Omega \times (s, \infty)$, and $u_1 > 0$ in Q_Ω but u is allowed to be complex valued. Then*

$$\omega(t) := osc_{\Omega \times \{t\}} \frac{u}{u_1} \leq \omega(t) \tag{8.18}$$

for $t \geq s$, and

$$\omega(t) \leq \theta_0 \omega(s) \tag{8.19}$$

for $t \geq s + 1$, where $\theta_0 := 1 - N_1^{-1} \in (0, 1)$ where $N_1 \geq 1$ is from the above theorem 30.

Now we consider the operator $L = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} + \sum b_i D_i$ with coefficients independent of time. We will show the above results will give us the existence of a gap in the spectrum of L that only depends on constants n, ν, S, r_0, R_0 and M_0 but not on L itself. we will call this gap a universal gap. More precisely, we consider the following eigenvalue problem:

$$-Lv = \lambda v \tag{8.20}$$

in Ω, and

$$v = 0$$

on $\partial\Omega$. The principal eigenvalue λ_1 is defined as the eigenvalue with the smallest real part. It is well-known actually λ_1 is real, algebraically simple, and the associated eigenfunction v_1 can be chosen positive. No other eigenvalue has a positive eigenfunction and we also have $\Re(\lambda) > \lambda_1$ for any other eigenvalue λ. One can find details in [BHV].

Theorem 32. *Let λ_1 be the principal eigenvalue of the above eigenvalue problem and let λ be any other eigenvalue of it. Then*

$$Re(\lambda) - \lambda_1 \geq \gamma > 0, \tag{8.21}$$

where γ is a constant only depending on constants n, ν, S, r_0, R_0 and M_0.

Proof. First of all, we notice that if $v(x)$ is an eigenfunction of the eigenvalue problem associated to an eigenvalue λ, then $u(x,t) := e^{-\lambda t}v(x)$ is a solution to the parabolic problem with $I = \mathbb{R}$. Now when $\lambda = \lambda_1$, $v = v_1$, then the function $u_1(x,t) := e^{-\lambda_1 t}v_1(x)$ is a positive solution of the parabolic problem on $\Omega \times I$. For $\lambda \neq \lambda_1$, clearly, v is not a constant multiple of v_1 so

$$\omega(t) := osc_{\Omega\times\{t\}} \frac{u}{u_1} = e^{(\lambda_1 - Re(\lambda))t}\omega(0), \tag{8.22}$$

where $\omega(0) = osc_\Omega \frac{v}{v_1} \neq 0$. From [HPS2], we also know $\omega(0) < \infty$. Now applying the result from the above Proposition 31, we conclude that

$$\omega(1) := e^{\lambda_1 - Re(\lambda)}\omega(0) \leq \theta_0\omega(0), \tag{8.23}$$

therefore

$$Re(\lambda) - \lambda_1 \geq c_0 := -\ln\theta_0 > 0. \tag{8.24}$$

We notice that c_0 only depends on the prescribed constants. □

9. Appendix

In the section 2, we briefly discussed a version of Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate which plays an important role in this paper. In this appendix, we prove the version of Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate we used. For more general cases, one can find details in [AIN]. Again, we use the notations $u \in W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}(Q)$ which means u_t, $D_i u$, $D_{ij}u \in (L^n_x L^\infty_t)_{loc}$. Also we assume $S := \int [\sup_t |b(x,t)|]^n \, dx < \infty$.

We will start with the associated version without drift. Consider

$$-u_t + \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u \geq f \tag{9.1}$$

where $f \in L^n_x L^\infty_t$.

In the following arguments, we will assume $u \in C^{2,1}$ instead of $u \in W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}$, but the results hold for $u \in W^{2,1}_{n,\infty}$ by standard approximation arguments as [KT].

Lemma 33. *Let $u \in C^{2,1}(Q_\Omega)$ and suppose $Q_\Omega = \Omega \times (0,T)$ with the diameter of Ω is r. Also assume $-u_t + \sum_{ij} a_{ij}D_{ij}u \geq f$ and $\sup_{\partial_p Q_\Omega} u \leq 0$. Then*

$$\sup_{Q_\Omega} u \leq N(\nu, n) r \left\| f_- \right\|_{L^n_x L^\infty_t}. \tag{9.2}$$

where f_- denotes the negative part of f.

Proof. First of all, we notice that it suffices to consider the positive part of the function u. So without loss of generality, we might assume $u = 0$ on $\partial_p Q_\Omega$. Following [KT, LE1], we might also assume for some $(x_0, \tau) \in \Omega$ with $0 < \tau \leq T$ such that $M = u(x_0, \tau) = \sup_\Omega u$. From the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [KT], we obtain the following estimate,

$$u(x_0,\tau)^{n+1} \leq Cr^n \int_{A_u} |\det(D_{ij}u(x,t))\, u_t(x,t)|\, dxdt \tag{9.3}$$

where

$$A_u = \{(x,t) \in \partial_t\Omega \times [0,\tau) : \exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n,\ s.t.\ u(y,s) \leq u(x,t) + \xi(y-x)\ \forall y \in \partial_t\Omega,\ 0 \leq s \leq \tau\}$$

and C only depends on n. Also by the discussion in [KT], for $(x,t) \in A_u$, $(D_{ij}u(x,t))$ is nonpositive and $u_t(x,t) \geq 0$. We have $\sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u \geq f$, i.e.,

$$-\sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u \leq f_- \tag{9.4}$$

on A_u. Therefore,

$$|\det(D_{ij}u(x,t))| = -\det(D_{ij}u(x,t)) \leq C(\nu) \left(-\sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u\right)^n \leq |f_-|^n \tag{9.5}$$

for all $(x,t) \in A_u$. Hence

$$u(x_0,\tau)^{n+1} \leq Cr^n \int_{A_u} |f_-|^n\, u_t(x,t)\, dxdt \leq Cr^n \int_{A_u} \left(\sup_t |f_-|^n\right) u_t(x,t)\, dxdt. \tag{9.6}$$

We project A_u onto Ω, and we denote the projected area in Ω as P_u. Let

$$I_u(x) = \{t \in [0, \tau[,\ (x,t) \in A_u\}. \tag{9.7}$$

Then one can write

$$u(x_0,\tau)^{n+1} \leq Cr^n \int_{P_u} \left(\sup_t |f_-|^n\right) \int_{I(x)} u_t(x,t) dxdt. \tag{9.8}$$

Let $y = x - h\frac{\xi}{|\xi|}$. where $h \geq d(x)$ is a positive number so that y on the boundary of Ω. By our condition on the boundary, we have $u(y,t) = 0$. Now by the definition of A_u,

$$0 \leq u(x,t) - h\,|\xi|\,.$$

Hence if $(x,t) \in A_u$ with ξ in the definition A_u, we obtain $|\xi| \leq \frac{u(x,t)}{d(x)}$ where $d(x)$ denotes the distance from x to $\partial\Omega$.

In order to analyze the time integration, we must understand the topology of $I_u(x)$. From above discussion, given the condition $|\xi| \leq \frac{u(x,t)}{d(x)}$, suppose we pick $t_i \in I_u(x)$ with associated ξ_i . Then $\{t_i\}$ is bounded and $\{|\xi_i|\}$ is also bounded, so we can pick a subsequence $\{t_{ik}\}$ with $\{\xi_{ik}\}$ so that $t_{ik} \to t_0$ and $\xi_{ik} \to \xi_0$. From the definition of t_i and ξ_i, we can conclude $t_0 \in I_u(x)$ since ξ_0 satisfies the condition in the definition of A_u. So we can also conclude that $I_u(x)$ is compact and is relatively closed to $[0,\tau]$ for all $x \in P_u$.

By the basic 1-dimensional topology, we know we can write $[0,\tau]\backslash I_u(x)$ as a disjoint union of finite intervals I_j, and each of them is one of the following four

forms: $[0,\alpha)$, (β,γ), $(\delta,\tau]$ with $\alpha \le \beta \le \gamma \le \tau$. Notice that by the definition of A_u and $I(x)$,

$$\int_{[0,\alpha)} u_t(x,t)\,dt = u(x,\alpha) - u(x,0) \ge 0 \tag{9.9}$$

since $\alpha \in I_u(x)$.

$$\int_{(\beta,\gamma)} u_t(x,t)\,dt = u(x,\gamma) - u(x,\beta) \ge 0 \tag{9.10}$$

since $\gamma \in I_u(x)$. For each $x \in P_u$, only at most one of the intervals in the decomposition of $[0,\tau]\backslash I(x)$ is of the form $(\delta,\tau]$. So

$$u(x,\tau) = \int_0^\tau u_t(x,t)\,dt \ge \int_{I_u(x)} u_t(x,t)\,dt + u(x,\tau) - u(x,\delta). \tag{9.11}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{I_u(x)} u_t(x,t)\,dt \le u(x_0,\tau),$$

which implies

$$u(x_0,\tau)^{n+1} \le Cr^n \int_{P_u} \left(\sup_t |f_-|\right)^n u(x_0,\tau)\,dx \tag{9.12}$$

and

$$u(x_0,\tau) \le Cr\,\|f_-\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty} \le Cr\,\|f\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty}\,. \tag{9.13}$$

□

Theorem 34. *(Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci-Krylov-Tso estimate) Let $u \in C^{2,1}(Q_\Omega)$ and suppose $Q_\Omega = \Omega\times(0,T)$ with the diameter of Ω is r. Also assume $-u_t + Lu \ge f$ and $\sup_{\partial_p Q_\Omega} u \le 0$. Then*

$$\sup_{Q_\Omega} u \le N(\nu,n,S)r\,\|f\|_{L_x^n L_t^\infty}\,. \tag{9.14}$$

Proof. Again as above we assume for some $(x_0,\tau) \in \Omega$ with $0 < \tau \le T$ such that $M = u(x_0,\tau) = \sup_\Omega u > 0$.

Given $-u_t + Lu \ge f$ with drift, we move the drift to the right hand side. Then by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Hölder's inequality, we obtain for a fixed constant $\mu \ne 0$ to be determined later

$$\begin{aligned} u_t - \sum_{ij} a_{ij} D_{ij} u &\le f_- + \sum_i b_i D_i u \\ &\le (\vec{b},\, \mu^{-1} f_-)\cdot(|\nabla u|\,,\mu) \\ &\le \left(\left|\sup_t b\right|^n + \left(\mu^{-1}\sup_t f_-\right)^n\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \left(|\nabla u|^n + \nu\mu^n\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} (1+1)^{\frac{n-2}{n}} \end{aligned} \tag{9.15}$$

We consider

$$D = \{(\xi,h) :\ |\xi| \le M/r,\ r\,|\xi| < h < M\} \tag{9.16}$$

following the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [KT]. We know if $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ is nonnegative, we have

$$\int_D g(\xi,h)\,d\xi dh \le \int_{A_u} g(\nabla u, u_t)\,|\det\left(D_{ij}u(x,t)u_t(x,t)\right)|\,dxdt. \tag{9.17}$$

Take

$$g(\xi,h) = \left(|\xi|^n + \mu^n\right)^{-1}. \tag{9.18}$$

Then the left hand side of (9.17) is

$$\int_D g(\xi,h)\,d\xi dh = C\int_0^{M/r} (M-kr)k^{n-1}\left(k^n+\mu^n\right)^{-1}dk. \tag{9.19}$$

For the right hand side of (9.17), by a similar argument as the above theorem, we can conclude

$$\int_{A_u} |f_-|^n\,u_t(x,t)\,dxdt \le C\int_{A_u}\left(\sup_t |f_-|^n\right)u_t(x,t)\,dxdt. \tag{9.20}$$

(9.21)
$$\int_{A_u} g(\nabla u,u_t)\,|\det\left(D_{ij}u(x,t)u_t(x,t)\right)|\,dxdt \le C\int_{P_u}\left(\left|\sup_t b\right|^n + \mu^{-n}\left(\sup_t f_-\right)^n\right)M\,dx.$$

So we need to calculate

$$\int_0^{M/r} (M-kr)k^{n-1}\left(k^n+u^n\right)^{-1}dk. \tag{9.22}$$

Notice that

$$(kr)k^{n-1}\left(k^n+u^n\right)^{-1} \le r, \tag{9.23}$$

$$\int_0^{M/r} Mk^{n-1}\left(k^n+\mu^n\right)^{-1}dk = M\log\left(\left(\frac{M}{r\mu}\right)^n+1\right). \tag{9.24}$$

So we can bound the left hand side of equation (9.21) from below,

$$M\log\left(\left(\frac{M}{r\mu}\right)^n+1\right) - M \le \int_0^{M/r}(M-kr)k^{n-1}\left(k^n+u^n\right)^{-1}dk. \tag{9.25}$$

Therefore,

$$M\log\left(\left(\frac{M}{r\mu}\right)^n+1\right) - M \le C\int\left(\left|\sup_t b\right|^n + \mu^{-n}\left(\sup_t f_-\right)^n\right)Mdx. \tag{9.26}$$

Since $M>0$, and if we take $\mu = \int(\sup_t f_-)$, one can conclude

$$\log\left(\left(\frac{M}{r\left\|f_-\right\|_{L_x^nL_t^\infty}}\right)^n+1\right) \le C\int\left(\left|\sup_t b\right|^n + C_1\right)dx, \tag{9.27}$$

where C and C_1 only depend on ν and n. Finally, we exponentiate both sides to obtain

$$M \le N\left(n,\nu,\int\left|\sup_t b\right|^n\right)r\left\|f_-\right\|_{L_x^nL_t^\infty}. \tag{9.28}$$

□

10. Acknowledgment

This work was initiated when I was still at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities. I would like to thank Professor Mikhail Safonov for suggesting this interesting problem to me, and for many motivating discussions. I also want to thank Professor Luis Silvestre for discussions on the supercritical scaling case and some related comments. Finally, I would like to thank Hao Jia, Tianling Jin, Jon Rubin, and Ben Seeger for their kind encouragement.

References

[BHV] Berestycki, H.; Nirenberg, L.; Varadhan, S. R. S. The principal eigenvalue and maximum principle for second-order elliptic operators in general domains. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 47 (1994), 47–92.

[CS13] Chen, G.; Safonov, M. V. On second order elliptic and parabolic equations of mixed type. arXiv:1401.0351.

[GC] Chen, G. Non-divergence parabolic equations of second order with critical drift in Morrey spaces. preprint.

[DG] De Giorgi, E. Sulla dierenziabilita e l'analiticita delle estremali degli integrali multipli regolari. Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. (3) 3 (1957), 25–43

[FSY] Fabes, E. B.; Safonov, M. V.; Yuan, Y. Behavior near the boundary of positive solutions of second order parabolic equations. II. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 351, no. 12 (1999), 4947–4961.

[FS] Ferretti, E.; Safonov, M. V. Growth theorems and Harnack inequality for second order parabolic equations. In Harmonic Analysis and Boundary Value Problems (Fayetteville, AR, 2000), vol. 277 of Contemp. Math., American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, USA, 2001, 87–112.

[LE1] Escauriaza, L. A note on Krylov-Tso's parabolic inequality. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 115 (1992), no. 4, 1053–1056.

[HPS1] Huska, J.; P. Polacik, P.; Safonov, M. V. Principal eigenvalues, spectral gaps and exponential separation between positive and sign-changing solutions of parabolic equations. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Dynamical Systems and Differential Equations, Pomona 2004. Disc. Cont. Dynamical Systems, Supplement 2005, pp. 427–435.

[HPS2] Huska, J.; P. Polacik, P.; Safonov, M. V. Harnack inequalities, exponential separation, and perturbations of principal Floquet bundles for linear parabolic equations. Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire 24 (2007), 711–739.

[NVK] Krylov, N. V. Estimates of the maximum of the solution of a parabolic equation and estimates of the distribution of a semimartingale. (Russian) Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 130(172) (1986), no. 2, 207–221.

[KS] Krylov, N. V.; Safonov, M. V. A certain property of solutions of parabolic equations with measurable coefficients. Izvestia Akad. Nauk SSSR, ser. Matem. 44, No. 1 (1980), 161–175 in Russian; English translation in Math. USSR Izvestija, 16, no. 1 (1981), 151–164.

[EML] Landis, E. M. Second Order Equations of Elliptic and Parabolic Type. Nauka, Moscow, 1971 in Russian; English transl.: Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.

[LSU] Ladyzhenskaya, O. A.; V. A. Solonnikov, V. A.; Ural'tseva, N. N. Linear and Quasi-linear Equations of Parabolic Type. Nauka, Moscow, 1967 in Russian; English transl.: Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1968

[GL] Lieberman, G. M. Maximum estimates for oblique derivative problems with right-hand side in L^p, $p < n$. Manuscr. Math., 112, 459–472 (2003).

[GL2] Lieberman, G. M. Second order parabolic differential equations. World scientific. 2005 [Rev. ed.]

[M61] Moser, J. On Harnack's theorem for elliptic differential equation. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 14 (1961), 577–591.

[M64] Moser, J. A Harnack inequality for parabolic differential equations. Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. 17 (1964), 101–134; and correction in: Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. 20 (1967), 231–236.

[N] Nash, J. Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations. Amer. J. Math. 80 (1958), 931–954

[AIN] Nazarov, A. I. Interpolation of linear spaces and maximum estimates for solutions of parabolic equations.(Russian) Part. Diff. Eq., Acad. Nauk SSSR, Siberian Dep. Math. Inst., Novosibirsk, 1987, pp. 50–72. MR 0994027.

[NU] Nazarov, A. I.; and Ural'tseva, N. N. The Harnack inequality and related properties of solutions of elliptic and parabolic equations with divergence-free lower-order coefficients. Algebra i Analiz 23 (2011), no. 1, 136–168.

[S80] Safonov, M. V. Harnack inequality for elliptic equations and the Holder property of their solutions. Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov (LOMI) 96 (1980), 272–287 in Russian; English translation in J. Soviet Math. 21, no. 5 (1983), 851–863.

[S98] Safonov, M. V. Estimates near the boundary for solutions to second order parabolic equations. Invited Lecture at the ICM in Berlin, August 18-27, 1998. In: Documenta Matematica, Extra Volume ICM 1998, vol. 1, pp. 637-647.

[S10] Safonov, M. V. Non-divergence elliptic equations of second order with unbounded drift. AMS Transl. Series 2. 229 (2010), 211–232.

[SVZ] Silvestre, L.; Vicol, V.; Zlatoš, A. On the loss of continuity for super-critical drift-diffusion equations. Arch. Rational Meeh. Anal. 207(2013), 845–877

[KT] Tso, K. On an Aleksandrov-Bakelman maximum principle for second-order parabolic equations. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 10 (1985), 543–553.

E-mail address: gc@math.uchicago.edu
URL: http://www.math.uchicago.edu/~gc/

Department of Mathematics, The University of Chicago, 5734 South University Avenue, Chicago, IL 60615, U.S.A